

ATTACHMENT

PHASE III TRAINING CRITIQUE

I. Introduction and Summary

- A. The writer has an intense interest in the results of the Agency's training courses. To date it must be admitted in all honesty and frankness that I have been disappointed in what I believe to be the training results. This is particularly true with respect to any demonstrable increase in the performance or efficiency, and more important, in an understanding of the Agency's responsibilities and the individual's role in the Agency, evidenced by personnel who have completed training.

The criticisms and recommendations offered in this paper are, it is hoped, both constructive and objective. The writer has given considerable thought to the problem of training for some years and has been able to observe the results of training for the past eight years both in the field and at headquarters. The problem of exercising operational and executive supervision over case officers and other personnel has probably emphasized the results or inadequacies of the training courses more than could any other position. It is hoped that this rather voluminous paper will make some contribution to solving the problem of equipping personnel to perform a Clandestine Services function.

- B. The general summary of the critique and recommendations regarding Phase III contained in this paper are as follows:

1. I believe that the objective of Phase III as stated is good. I do not feel that the objective is achieved.
2. The reasons the objective is not achieved are:
 - a. the policy considerations, the regulations and the procedures are not related in a practical or positive way to the cases.
 - b. the major emphasis is placed on operational security or "tradecraft" considerations.
 - c. written assignments either do not have a place in the course or are not sufficiently explained or followed up.
 - d. seminar periods are inadequate from the standpoints of time, direction or leadership and topics discussed.
 - e. there is an overemphasis on liaison

SECRET

- f. the scope of the course was too broad with the result that little if anything was covered completely in terms of the objective.
 - g. there is a let down in the course after starting at a high plane since there is almost no relation of the regulations and the policy considerations to the cases studied.
 - h. the student is not shown how the DD/P functions.
3. The objectives of the course were completely or at least partially achieved in the following fields:
- a. pinpointing of regulations
 - b. description of the organizational framework and an insight into some of the mechanisms of support and guidance
 - c. the concept of Planning and Programming on the senior level
 - d. the illustration of world wide problems
 - e. the operational security - "tradeecraft" - considerations
 - f. the problems of liaison
4. Recommendations which might assist the course to achieve the objective are:
- a. a more rigid selection and compartmentation of students
 - b. a revision of the approach to and use of the seminar to permit maximum benefit to be derived from this device which allows the exchange of ideas.
 - c. elimination of extraneous reading material
 - d. a rescheduling of the course either with respect to shortening the time period or in terms of fully developing the material
 - e. offering the student an insight into solutions rather than to make him imply or infer the results of his efforts
 - f. certain revisions in lecture material
 - g. the establishment of an atmosphere or stage for the course
 - h. reorganization of reading material into briefs
 - i. revision and/or elimination of certain cases as detailed below.

j. imposition of discipline

k. revision of the grading or evaluation system

II. General Comments

- A. The first observation about training as a whole concerns a matter which could possibly be incorporated into Phase III. The purpose would be for restatement or reemphasis rather than for introduction.

It was my impression that generally personnel completing training do not know why they have completed training. They are aware of the so-called "tradecraft"; they are aware of the fact that security in operations, and, to a lesser extent personal security, is a paramount consideration when accepting assignment in the DD/P; they recognize that the DD/P complex is a constantly changing behemoth; they are cognizant of the fact that the Agency has certain responsibilities and receives policy from a rather nebulous and high level council, but, they are not fully conscious of what I believe to be the basic reason they are in the DD/P or the Agency.

Perhaps I am exaggerating the problem when I believe that it is insufficient for personnel to state that they have received training "to learn how to collect intelligence" because "the government wants intelligence". By themselves and if based on sound reasoning and logic these answers are honest and accurate.

Personnel apparently are not adequately equipped or motivated with the knowledge of why they, as individuals, are in an intelligence agency, why that intelligence agency was established and it's attendant responsibilities in the terms or with an interpretation which will permit them to engage in a duel or wits; a duel of ideologies.

Personnel must be indoctrinated in and understand those principles of America and of the American government which will permit them to collect intelligence within this Agency.

The collection of intelligence through clandestine or covert methods means that the individual must be able to sell or convince another individual to perform a function, service or act by direction or guidance and with understanding. Therefore, applying the principle of salesmanship the seller must understand his product and be able to influence the buyer or the agent.

My reasoning may be obtuse but the two points I am trying to make are:

1. The individual should be more than vaguely aware that he, as an

SECRET

individual and as a part of the Agency, has a tremendous responsibility and a monumental task ahead of him if he is to be even partially successful in clandestine activities, and

2. the underlying theme for all training should be to equip personnel to counter communism verbally and ideologically and, more importantly, to assist personnel in learning how to convince or "con" another individual into performing a service or function in an intelligence or espionage sense.

Training in "tradecraft", the apparent theme of training at present, and an understanding of the DD/P or Clandestine Services will only be effective and fruitful in direct proportion to the individual's ability to relate and apply these aids or techniques to the basic problem of dealing with the human beings who are the instruments of intelligence collection.

- B. The second general observation relates to the last point above (paragraph A 2b). Training should stress and reflect the individual's appreciation of basic knowledge and understanding of how to deal with people and situations. The devices of seminar and specific problems should be utilized to solicit solutions which are not the "school" or rather the "tradecraft" solution.

The trainee, when assuming his duties in either the field or headquarters but particularly in the field, is going to be faced with many many problems which will defy solution or be complicated by an unreasoned application of "tradecraft". He must be equipped to cope with these problems even though the actual training involved is nothing more than a recognition by the individual that a great many of the problems can be solved by using "horse sense".

I believe there is a distinct tendency to overcomplicate and mystify the approach to the collection of intelligence. The training courses which emphasize a new jargon and shroud the machinations of the intelligence collector or case officer in "tradecraft" techniques, i.e., the recognition signal, the dead drop, etc., tend to obscure the fact that the intelligence collector must live, look and act normal even when "tradecrafting". The individual is often so absorbed in being clandestine and implementing his training techniques that his behavior becomes abnormal.

- C. The third general comment concerns, again, a theme which should run throughout training. The individual is the important element in the Agency; it is the individual who collects information, who develops the skills and talents required to initiate and maintain clandestine activities; it is the individual intelligence collector who makes the wheels turn or the echelons work. The individual feeds the machine raw intelligence and the machine disseminates intelligence only in direct proportion to the skills and ability of the collector or feeder.

The attitude currently expressed by some instructors in Phase III, as well as generally throughout training, (perhaps the Agency) to the effect that the trainees or so-called junior officers are "peons" unable to exert any influence on or against the "exalted levels" is wrong. No trainee should ever be left with the impression that he, as an individual, is not important and does not occupy an important position. No trainee should be permitted to believe or imply that he stands alone, incapable of exerting influence or receiving guidance except in rare instances. The trainee should be prepared to expect good guidance; to demand assistance and to assume the responsibility of doing his job to the best of his ability with no thought that he will not have support.

- D. The final general comment is one which is difficult to implement and, perhaps, difficult to understand when advocated. It is my opinion that discipline should be instituted within the training framework. I do not mean discipline in the sense of revelling and mustering nor in the sense of keeping the students busy with reading and writing. I mean discipline in the sense that the student or trainee is instilled with the idea that he is undergoing training for only one purpose and that any deviation from that purpose will not equip him to do his job. He is being equipped to collect intelligence.

The purpose for which he is being trained should be emphasized from the moment he begins training and should follow him through all training courses. The trainee should be thoroughly indoctrinated with the idea that he is being trained to perform a function which is vital; a function which few, if any, ever perform adequately; a function which must be lived and which is not just an eight hour day, and a function which is deadly serious in import and consequences.

The discipline should be a mental discipline which is constantly with the trainee. He should not be permitted to become lackadaisical or lazy in his thinking or approach to training. The purpose [redacted] to separate the trainee from outside influences, should be exploited. The trainee should live his training the entire time that he is in training. The problems should be real to him and they should not end just when he leaves the classroom. In his future jobs they will not end if he is conscientious and able when he leaves his desk or office and particularly if he is to be successful. The trainee should be trained to think in terms of his job being everpresent in his thinking and acting. He should be encouraged and stimulated to question and discuss any and all ideas and aspects of training and should be imbued with the concept that curiosity and again, ideas, are the backbone of his job. He should never be permitted to be satisfied with a task or assignment or job. He should be given the theme that his work is never complete and can always be bettered.

25X1A

III. Specific Critique

- A. As stated above I do not feel that the course objective is achieved. This statement must be qualified to a certain extent.

First it is recognized that it is difficult to present a picture, much less an understanding, of a framework or structure which is constantly changing. Principles, not structure, are the important points and the emphasis should be placed in all lectures and in the study of all cases on the principles which apply. The title or name of the unit performing the function may change but if the function is essential to the Clandestine Services it will remain and should be what the student remembers.

Secondly, it is my impression that Phase III is designed for the new employee--.."initial assignment under supervision"...- and therefore, again, it is difficult to present material which will make sense to personnel who have no real concept of the actual way in which the DD/P functions. The principle concept can be applied to this problem however.

As a third qualification it is recognized that to a great extent personalities, ability and experience determine the structure and efficiency of any component of the DD/P and that it is impossible to convey this properly in a "canned" lecture or even to a lesser extent in a seminar under instruction.

Finally, it is my opinion that the material used in presenting information about the organization and particularly the function of the DD/P is handout, i.e., it is received from the staff or component concerned and in many cases there is no way for the instructor or lecturer to know if the component actually functions as stated or if that component only desires or plans to function as stated.

- B. The reasons why I do not feel that the objective is achieved are:

1. The student is not shown, in a practical or positive way, the relationship between the problems encountered in the cases and the regulations, procedures, intra-division procedures and inter-component or staff relations.
2. Basic policy considerations and the development of policy are not clearly enough defined in relation to the desk officer or case officer and his operational or even mechanical or procedural problems which are emphasized in Phase II.
3. The major emphasis in the course is placed on operational security considerations. The course bogs down in "tradecraft" and seems to be a direct not a transitional continuance of Phase II. The "tradecraft" field should be and apparently is easiest for both the trainees and the instructors to grasp, particularly since most of the students have just completed Phase II. It was noted that there were a few efforts to shift the seminar discussions to broader fields but, for the most part, these discussions soon

X1A2d2

4. Certain written assignments, particularly the emphasis on intelligence report writing do not appear to have a place in this course. Perhaps an extremely loose interpretation of the phrase "operational objectives" in the Phase III objective could be used to justify the inclusion of the report writing exercises but in actual fact report writing does not fit into the course. The inclusion of intelligence reporting as part of Phase III appears to be a means of getting such an aspect of intelligence activity into training. It is tacked on and seems to be a device to (1) justify the amount of time spent of [REDACTED] (2) to permit a grading or evaluation of the student, or (3) to keep the students busy. 25X1A2d1
5. The other written assignments, other than the one cable writing exercise in the [REDACTED] case, are not satisfactory in that there is no attempt to illustrate to the student where or how he, as an individual, is applying his knowledge or common sense to the problem and where or how he may have failed to fulfill or understand the assignment. No attempt is made to point out the essential elements which should or should not have been included or considered in the assignment. It is recognized that there is supposedly no school solution. However, this supposition is belied by the fact that the written assignments are graded and/or evaluated and by the fact that there are certainly major elements in operations and with respect to policy and coordination which are applicable in each and every case. The matter of interpretation and specific points cannot perhaps be stipulated in each case but it is possible to stimulate and draw from the students a reasonable, logical and practical approach to the problem which will permit them to make analogies or draw parallels in the future. 25X1A2d1
6. The seminar discussions do not permit full exploitation or discussion of the major points of interest in the cases according to the objective of the course. Time is a factor, of course, but at times there is a too rigid adherence to the reading material during the seminar when it must be presumed that all have read and at least partially digested the material. It is a waste of time and effort to leaf through the reading assignment pointing out the pertinent, or what appear to be the pertinent, points instead of assuming that the students has recognized and accepted his responsibility

and is prepared to discuss issues bearing on objectives, coordination, planning, etc.

The major failing of the seminars is the fact that they tend to degress and confine the discussions to the operational security or "tradecraft" aspects of the particular case. In most cases it appears that "tradecraft" is uppermost in both the minds of the students and the instructors and it is seldom that the trap is avoided. This diverts the attention of the students and the charted course of Phase III from the objective except in the operational security sense.

It is also evident during the seminars that many of the instructors are not familiar with the material. Consequently the leafing through the material and the tendency to bog down in "tradecraft" which all can discuss permits the instructor to "cover" the material and fill the time limit. It is also apparent that some instructors have difficulty relating the material to the larger aspects of the course objective.

7. There is an overemphasis on liaison although I must admit a certain prejudice since, in my opinion, there is an Agency overemphasis on liaison. Perhaps, in a practical sense, because of the Agency position and policy with respect to liaison this is important because so many trainees will be engaged in liaison and seldom if ever will they act independently. It is believed, however, that the concentration on liaison in which at least five of the cases deal with liaison could be minimized and some effort could be made to illustrate the so-called unilateral or independent approach to intelligence collection.
8. The course attempted to cover too much ground. This attempted broad coverage did not permit full understanding or an exploitation of the manifold problems which are evident in certain cases. In other words by attempting to illustrate too many problems with too many cases it was necessary to superficially treat almost all of the cases. At least this broad coverage prevented an adequate coverage of the problems even though almost all of the problems were or could have been apparent in certain cases. The shotgun approach to complicated problems seldom teaches or even illustrates the proper way to zero in on a target.
9. The phrase "under supervision" in the objective to the course is a key part of the course. The course does not, however, show the trainee where each element in the DD/P, as defined in the paper Planning Considerations and Approaches to Operational Activities fits into the scheme of things with respect to the cases studied.

In other words it is up to the student to relate, in terms of his own experience or ideas and on the basis of the one paper, the responsibilities of the principals in the cases. There is no evidence of the supervision in terms of either how it is exercised or from where it is derived.

25X1A

10. There is no reference to or direct relation to the [redacted]s once they have been read. The exception to this is in regard to the reporting problems or exercises wherein it is necessary to refer to the [redacted] if the format for the report is to be applied to the exercise. Again the student must infer the connection between the regulations and the cases unless another student or individual instructor more or less inadvertently makes such a reference. 25X1A
11. The student is not shown how the DD/P functions in relation to supporting or guiding either the field elements or the headquarters operating elements in any kind of a specific sense. The implied and often expressed attitude is that headquarters is an amorphous mass, functioning primarily for self preservation or perpetuation, which resists stimulus from the field where the "poor little peon beats his brains out". As I read the course objective the student should at least have a basic understanding of how he will fit into a functioning structure and he actually should emerge from Phase III with more than just an implication or inference of how the DD/P functions.
12. The student is not shown how basic policy considerations actually affect him and his role in or with respect to those considerations. There is no relation of the basic policy considerations to the operational objectives which the student will be required to attempt to achieve. There is no relation of the existing regulations to the operational objectives and/or policy considerations when in actual fact it is possible for anyone who has been in the DD/P or Agency for some time to see where regulations have evolved from both operational objectives and the criteria these objectives demand and basic policies.
13. The student is not actually kept busy thinking. There is wasted time. The course is padded with details and trivia which do not stimulate the student. The student is not placed in the situation where it is necessary to do much more than superficially treat the material. The reason for this is because he is not stimulated or placed in a position where he must reason or use his knowledge to solve a problem of guidance, support or coordination. This is particularly true of experienced personnel who are assigned to the course.

14. To sum up - the course starts out on the highest plane by setting the pattern or establishing the framework within which the student supposedly is to be working in the future. After this has been done, however, the student is placed back into Phase II for the remaining three weeks of the course. The operational or "tradercraft" trials and tribulations should be well known to the student and the instructors but they are again considering, and even concentrating, on those same elements instead of concretely relating planning and procedures to the accomplishment of operational objectives. The procedures which must be followed if he is to use his "tradercraft" productively; the basic policy considerations and the coordination or mechanics which permit him to use his "tradercraft" are ignored, superficially treated or inferred. Phase III should not be a continuation of Phase II in a literal sense. In an overall sense Phase III should be a continuation of Phase II just as it is a continuation of Phase I and the forerunner to other courses such as the CE course or the CPO course. Phase III should help to equip the student but it should carry the student above Phase II and it should be assumed that the student is capable of applying Phase II "tradercraft" during Phase III. He does not require a refresher or a concentrated "tradercraft" course at this stage of his development.

IV. Course Achievements

- A. As stated above I do not feel that the objective of the course is achieved. This, again, requires certain qualification since I have listed the reasons why I feel we did not attain the objective without mentioning the fields in which I feel it was partially or adequately achieved. It is difficult for me to recognize exactly where the objectives were achieved in a positive sense because, perhaps erroneously (on the basis of my written work and tests), I found very little in the course which contributed to my general or specific knowledge or understanding of the DD/P. In a specific sense there were undoubtedly points wherein I benefited and it was certainly valuable to be required to read or reread the prescribed regulations. As a whole, however, the course was quite frustrating in that it was possible to discern errors in function as they were described or to make comparisons which one felt could have been covered more fully or explained in greater detail. It must also be noted that when it is not necessary for one to apply oneself or when there is little or no stimulus or provocation for constructive thought which can be expressed within the context of the course, it is difficult for one to realize any real benefit. The problem is to relate the course to the new employee even though I feel the above is required qualification.
- B. The aspects of the course in which I believe the objectives were at least partially achieved were:
 1. The course pinpointed the regulations which a desk or case officer

must be concerned with if he is to function.

2. Certain procedures and the basic organizational framework were described and illustrated. This will provide the student with a basic frame of reference before he is actually plunged into the maelstrom.
3. The concept of Planning and Programming on the highest level within the Agency was ably and graphically illustrated. The significance of the PFC should be uppermost in most trainees minds although I do not believe the working level role or the relation to the area desk or functioning unit is properly expressed.
4. The course presented a varied operational and organizational framework for the case studies and although there was some concentration on liaison areas there was a presentation of the fact that the DD/P has world wide problems which are basically the same or similar.
5. In emphasizing problems connected with working with groups or foreign intelligence services.
6. In providing the trainee a peek into the mechanism which supports the field in terms of agent clearances, technical assistance, etc. The trainee is at least aware that there is behind him a superstructure which, if it can be reached and moved, prodded and stimulated, can provide him with guidance and support.
7. There is a graphic illustration of the operational security standards necessary if clandestine activities are to be successful. The basic reasons for the publication of regulations proscribing procedures and standards are evident even though it is necessary for the trainee to arrive at this conclusion pretty much on his own.

V. Recommendations

- A. The major emphasis to this point in the critique has been with what I believe are the reasons the objective of the course was not achieved. I hope to present some recommendations regarding possible ways in which the course might be changed or revised in order to achieve the objective. However, there will again be certain minor criticisms which will be interlaced with the recommendations. Some of these may not be directly related to the course objective although they have a distinct and proper bearing on the goal. I do not desire or intend to nitpick but I do also feel very strongly that a good training course is essential to the future of the Agency. Personally it has been my experience that it is often necessary to have to attempt to re-do or retrain ^{PERSONNEL} before they can adequately perform an operational assignment. A situation such as that is not good. If nothing else is achieved training should equip personnel to enter into the flexible DD/P framework with understanding and the ability to adjust with a minimum of effort.

If by critiquing at length and by knifpicking I can offer some constructive recommendation or comment, I think that I will have achieved some purpose. I do not presume to know all of the answers; to understand all of the problems nor to offer all of the solutions. It is hoped, however, that someone else may be able to consider one of the points raised herein and perhaps expand the point or institute action which will alter or change the situation for the better or be stimulated to think of a point which I may have overlooked.

B. Specific Recommendations

1. The criteria for the selection of students should be reexamined. The individual or individuals assigning personnel to Phase III should more carefully assess the individual's experience and capabilities in order to provide the individual with the most beneficial training in terms of the actual course. A look at the curriculum does not indicate adequately what constitutes the course.

I also feel that there is a criteria which has permeated the Agency which is detrimental. That feeling is - no training - no promotion or field assignment. I may be overstating the feeling but I am convinced that it is a fact that such an attitude does exist. It is evident on personnel or promotion actions where it is stated that... promotion effective contingent upon completion of courses X, Y or Z or promotion effective when scheduling for X course is complete. To a limited extent this attitude is evident in Phase III. The purpose of training, i.e., equipping people to do the job, should be stressed and omnipresent. It is recommended that a concerted effort be made to emphasize to the students why they are taking training.

A second recommendation concerning the selection or assignment of personnel to training courses is that training instructors have an opportunity to assess the individual, unless a new employee, prior to being faced with the task of training him.

2. Experienced people should either be separated from inexperienced people or the course, particularly the seminars, should be better designed or conducted so as to exploit the experienced people in a positive manner. It is frustrating for an experienced person to participate in a seminar in which it is necessary to fully and carefully examine problems which are comparatively easy to solve or which are known details in order to benefit the group as a whole. In many cases it would be possible to exploit the experienced personnel but there is a natural reluctance on the part of the individual to volunteer information which might result in embarrassing or assuming control of the seminar from the instructor. Exploitation of experienced people could also serve to stimulate the seminar

and prevent it from bogging down in "tradedcraft".

3. The seminars should be longer, and if possible, smaller. There is not sufficient time to explore the many ramifications of a given problem in either the real or practical sense or in the theoretical sense. Evening seminars should be conducted and the students should be thoroughly mixed in small groups. I realize that there is a limit to the amount of time an instructor can spend in his duties so I suggest a seminar leader be appointed or selected by or from the students.

The purpose of the evening seminar would be to generate discussion of ideas and philosophies among the students - ideas are what we deal with and are the basic foundation for clandestine activities. Students should be encouraged to advance their ideas even if in the "bull session" and even if "by assignment".

The backbone of Phase III should be the seminar both among students and with the instructors. In line with the latter it is believed that a freer intercourse between students and instructors is to be recommended. This intercourse should not be accomplished in a manner which indicates checking on activities nor should it be interpreted as another means of evaluating. It should be a means of stimulation for both.

25X1A2d1

25X1A2d1

4. There is too much immaterial and detailed reading matter. The [redacted] case is an excellent example of minutiae not contributing to the course objective. The student becomes lost in details unless he has the ability to properly equate the importance of the material. The reading matter should be basic and thought provoking but should not be minor points stressed to the ridiculous such as [redacted]. Relate the death to the case and then "pass on" to the overall case without bogging down. If it is necessary to include details for the purpose of illustration of the significance of details include details in only one case and then relate those details specifically to an objective understanding of the case.

COURSE

5. The ~~course~~ is much too long with respect to the actual material covered. There is a distinct impression that it has been necessary to make the course five weeks in length and that, therefore, the course will be filled with stretchers. Detailed reading material or intelligence reporting assignments are apparently the devices used to pad the course.

25X1A

There is too much free time. Everyone enjoys a leisurely life but I believe that the opportunity which [redacted] offers should be exploited. The students should be kept busy - not with padded

assignments or imposed reading material of the detailed nature - with assignments which stimulate thought and discussion. Written assignments purely as exercises will not suffice either. The student should be made to "live and work" his training in a real sense by giving him the same basic problems, the same worries and frustrations he would encounter in his actual job.

As an example it is recommended that the students be given positive assignments of actually supporting the field case officers. Make the student discuss, argue and convince his branch chief, his Division staff officers, representatives from [REDACTED] FI plans and operations, his Division Chief that a course of action he recommends is required. Make him secure a release for his correspondence. Make him support a project or operational proposal. Give the student a group of contemporaries, i.e., other case officers in his branch or section, where he can test his ideas and theories. In each case all elements can be represented by either students or, if desired, instructors. Make the student figure how to accomplish his job and who he should see and discuss the problem with. The student has a frame of reference from the lectures and the regulations. He should apply the knowledge in a practical and thought provoking manner.

25X1A6a

6. The student should not be left to interpret or imply solutions. Admittedly in most cases there is no "school solution" and this point is stressed during the course. There are however, certain written assignments which concerned operational guidance. The student should be offered some basis for comparison for his efforts. An attempt to do just this was made in certain seminars but for the most part the student was left floundering and wondering if he got the point. In most cases there is at least a basis for comparison, a partial solution or a reasonable basis for presenting a solution. The proposed solutions should be fully and completely developed in such a way that every student has an opportunity to present or defend his views and ideas and to understand the basic reasoning behind any determination of a course of action.
7. In connection with 6. above the assignments should be specific if it is desired that the student produce a written assignment for evaluation. Several cases were noted where the student could and did interpret assignments differently than did other students and the instructors.
8. On the whole the lectures were good and adequate. There are certain points pertaining to some lectures which might be made however:
 - a. The lecture on PPC did not tie down for the case officer his relationship to the PPC and what effect the PPC will actually have on his job. The lecture failed to reach below the senior

SECRET

staff DD/P level to show implementation in a real or functional sense or in policy interpretation. The interpretation of FI policy was particularly weak. This is an important aspect which directly affects all case or desk officers. In addition to a more explicit lecture in this sense, it is recommended that there be a follow-up in the cases in order to relate the PFC functions to the case officer.

- b. The lecture on the DD/P structure was too "canned". The mechanics are not illustrated, i.e., how does the framework actually function. There is not an adequate relation of the framework to the case officer or desk officer. The command line should also be clarified. The proper staff role and function should be indicated. There is a too strict adherence to and rigid interpretation of the regulations during the lecture. Admittedly there is a great variance in components and elements but the regulations are flexible and permit interpretation which permits the desk officer to perform more efficiently. This fact and the proper interpretation along these lines should be in evidence during the lecture.

It should be stressed that the key to functioning in headquarters is interpretation of regulations and determination of how to use the framework illustrated. The impression of the DD/P lecture, even though there is an attempt to qualify the presentation, is that the framework and procedures are fairly out and dried.

This lecture is or should be the focal point for the course. It is recommended that the student be assisted to relate every activity and every problem in the case studies to the DD/P framework. In other words the student should be shown how he actually must use the framework when for instance he attempts to obtain an operational clearance. He should be able to go through training procedures leading to the proper echelons or channels of coordination and eventually end with the action element.

- c. It is recommended that the lecture on report writing and procedures be eliminated from the course. In accordance with criticism noted elsewhere in this paper this lecture appears to be an arbitrary imposition on the course and should be fitted into either Phase I or Phase II.
- d. The lecture on TSS gave the impression, by concentrating on Research and Developmental aspects, that this staff was making major contributions to the Clandestine Services on a high level plane. The notable lack in the lecture was the fact that there was no answer to the question "what if being researched and developed and why?". There was no purpose defined and there

was no relation in a practical sense between TSS and operations.

It is recommended that the TSS lecture be put into its proper context within the DD/P, i.e., a supporting staff for operations and how that support is actually requested and obtained. More concentration should be placed on those aspects of TSS which case or desk officers are going to be concerned with and desire. For instance the availability of secret writing methods and documentation should be clearly defined in terms of how they are to be obtained, the capabilities of TSS to actually produce and release these items, and the procedures which must be followed to obtain the items. Students should know what and how operational information on travel controls, documentation, etc., may be obtained from TSS in addition to the basic information regarding the availability of such information. TSS can and should be an invaluable aid to case officers and its functions and duties should not be shrouded in mystery or misrepresented by a concentration on those activities which will seldom if ever assist the average case officer.

- e. The lectures on foreign intelligence agencies with the exception of the Chinese Communist services were obscured with details. It is recommended that instead of concentrating on names and minor details which are actually of significance only to the specialist in the particular area that the lectures be geared to clarify the principles and functioning of the systems in order to provide the student with a basis for comparison and general understanding of the service. The impact and importance to the cases and in understanding the problems of liaison becomes lost when essentially irrelevant details are included.
 - f. It is recommended that a lecture concerning the theory and concept of exclusive KUBARK operations be included in the course. For example a lecture or a case in which KUBARK alone, not in conjunction with any other service, agency or element engages in an espionage function would definitely benefit the students. The principle of the singleton staff agent acting unbeknownst to the host government or any service would contribute to the students general knowledge. I assume that the Agency is attempting to initiate such activities even in those areas where liaison is the present modus operandi and students should be made aware of the fact that they will quite likely be faced with such a problem in the future.
9. Since the case histories are all placed within the time period (roughly) of 1950-1952, it is suggested that a climate or atmosphere for the course be established from the very beginning. I recommend a basic lecture or indoctrination in the world situation and the demands or requirements placed upon the Agency at this

time in its history be the first lecture students attend. Set the stage for the course by informing the student that for the next five weeks he will be living in and have to adjust his thinking to the particular time period.

The basic lecture setting the stage for the course should then be bolstered with newsreels from the time period. Newspapers, clippings of headlines made into handouts or distributed in the morning as are regular newspapers would constantly remind students of the period and keep them abreast of developments which they would have to interpret with respect to the cases. Introduce the newsreels at the beginning of the special movies. It might also be valuable to select those students who have knowledge of or were in the areas concerned during the time period for short seminar talks on the general or specific situation in the area at the time.

A basic problem which was noted was the inability of the students who are new to the Agency or who were fairly well isolated during previous agency assignments, to relate the existing situation to the situation as it existed 2, 3 or 4 years ago. Of particular importance in this sense is the fact that for the most part the regulations which the student is using in judging the cases were an outgrowth of practices initiated in response to the world situation and demands on the Agency.

It is also suggested that the creation of such an atmosphere would make the problem of relating policy considerations and operational objectives to the operational security and "tradecraft" problems more real and substantive, and consequently easier.

10. Case support reading material is too great in terms of volume in proportion to an understanding of the cases. I recommend that the cases be reexamined from the standpoint of eliminating material which does not materially contribute to the case or which is padded detail. If the report writing exercises are discontinued this problem will partially be solved. Specifically the [redacted] and [redacted] cases are padded with irrelevant reading material.

It is recommended that the reading material be briefed in order to present the problems and objectives and to stimulate thought and discussion. As a further suggestion on how to accomplish this it probably would assist the instructors if the students could indicate as they read the case the material which is superfluous. After one or possibly two courses it is believed that there would be a fairly clear indication of the material which did not aid the students.

11. Specific comments on the cases are as follows:

a. [redacted]

- 1) Coverage complete. Briefing not adequate in terms of actual situation or created situation. Assignments were difficult to understand or interpret because you were expected to perform or base a judgement on an activity in which you would normally have a great deal of knowledge. There was nothing concrete to tie to and consequently too much speculation and inference. The case was incomplete since did not show file checks, etc.; the first normal accomplishment in such a case.
- 2) time allowed was sufficient although more ^{Seminar} ~~similar~~ time would have permitted development of liaison themes and policies as well as an illustration of headquarters coordination.
- 3) case was material contribution to the course in terms of objectives although, again, we missed the opportunity to really exploit the planning and policy relationships; the operational objectives of the Agency and the functioning of the DD/P. The interferences were present but the specifics were lacking.

25X1A2d1

b. [REDACTED]

- 1) Coverage too complete in the sense that there was an extreme tendency to bog down in details and "tradercraft". It appeared that most of the students misunderstood the principles of the liaison operation and had a tendency to consider the KUBARK case officer and the guidance which should be given to the field in terms of an ability to apply the "tradercraft" techniques. When introducing the case it is suggested that a few moments be devoted to the point that the purpose is not to judge the "tradercraft" application in terms of our case officers. The purpose is to recognize those aspects and then relate the inadequacies to the problem of liaison and the ultimate objectives of the liaison.
- 2) More than sufficient time except in seminars
- 3) good with respect to liaison and operational objectives but should have been excellent. One excellent attempt to achieve what I consider the important aspects of the case was made by [REDACTED] in one seminar. The students were placed in the position of attempting to decide branch policy with respect to the liaison, the position of the field representatives, etc. Unfortunately time limitations on the seminar prevented full exploitation of an excellent beginning.

25X1A9a

I recommend that this approach to the problem of achieving

the course objective be carefully examined and adopted to all of the other cases since it not only serves to stimulate thought and discussion but also permits an active relation of minor "tradescraft" problems to the larger considerations. It is suggested that staff elements could be included in the discussions after branch policy is determined.

25X1A2d1

c. [REDACTED]

- 1) excellent coverage although perhaps could have been examined a bit more carefully from the CE protective standpoint.
- 2) more than sufficient time. Believe that time spent on case could be cut at one fourth with no loss of value.
- 3) the major contribution to the course was in terms of operational security standards. If the coverage in the other cases can be realigned so that they also do not concentrate on operational security standards this case, when condensed and moved at a bit faster pace, should adequately cover this aspect of the course objective. Recommend, however, that serious consideration be given to condensing this case to a reading assignment and a rather brief discussion. Primary value seems to lie in presenting CE type case as illustration.

25X1A2d1

d. [REDACTED]

- 1) Coverage was excellent except for inclusion of policy considerations and agency requirements. The situation regarding agency requirements and the world situation which developed as the case progressed could be more adequately covered during the introduction to the case. This case offers an excellent opportunity to tie in high level policy with case officer functioning by tracing action from the PPC down through all echelons. As an example of headquarters and field case officer functioning this case is the best example and has the most potential.
- 2) There is insufficient time in terms of seminar exploitation. The points made previously regarding student participation as command or staff elements could be used to a distinct advantage in this case since every staff and channel has to be considered when examining the case. Outside agencies also enter into the case, both locally in the field and at headquarters.
- 3) This is the best case in terms of overall coverage of course

objectives. Recommend eliminating some details such as information reports. The device of pairing a PM officer with an FI officer was excellent and should be encouraged by permitting more time for general discussion of the written results.

25X1A2d1

e. [REDACTED]

- 1) Coverage to the point where the case was beat to death several times.
- 2) Time was wasted. There were too many incidental and trivial details which did not contribute to the course. Believe the case should be cut to one day. The points of coordination and operational objectives were easily determined but were obscured or not sufficiently illustrated because of the concentration on details.
- 3) some contribution to the course from the coordination standpoint but the opportunity to show how the DD/P effected the coordination was lost. A four hour seminar could illustrate both internal and outside agency coordination and the derivation of policy as well as to permit discussion of the case. Unless the student was already familiar with the processes of coordination he could not have gained any insight to the problem in [REDACTED]

25X1A2d1

25X1A2d1

f. [REDACTED]

- 1) coverage complete to the point where case bogged down in details which do not materially contribute to the course. The "tradercraft" trap was perhaps most in evidence in this case. There was a definite feeling that this case was padded to fill time. A secondary feeling was that because the Agency had failed so miserably in this case it was necessary to elaborate on each little point in order to impress the student. This may be a useful objective but am of the opinion that some of the impact was lost because there was no real direction and because repetition is only effective so many times.
- 2) there was more than sufficient time
- 3) the case aided in the course but with better direction and streamlining rather than inference it could have made a major contribution to the course. Again it was necessary for the student to relate the case to the DD/P complex pretty much according to his own interpretation. A relation of this case to the world situation and agency requirements at time of inception would be invaluable. This case, in conjunction with [REDACTED] both because of the time

25X1A2d1

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

elements and because they show approaches on different sides of the globe, could well be one of the two best cases in the course. With direction and realignment both in terms of seminar control and elimination of trivia this case could show DD/P functioning and relations between field and headquarters.

Chief, [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A8a

CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~